



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,057	08/08/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10008239-1	1477

7590 01/19/2006
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ZHOU, TING

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/924,057	SIMPSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ting Zhou	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-19, 21-25, 27-33, 35-40, 42-49, 51-55, 57 and 58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-19, 21-25, 27-33, 35-40, 42-49, 51-55, 57 and 58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 5 October 2005 have been received and entered. Claims 2-8, 10-19, 21-25, 27-33, 35-40, 42-49, 51-55, 57 and 58 as amended are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 2-7 and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by LeMole et al. U.S. Patent 6,009,410 (hereinafter “LeMole”).

Referring to claims 4 and 13, LeMole teaches a method and program product comprising the steps of: receiving redirection initiation to redirect the browser (initiation of redirection of the browser via user input such as input of user ID or URL address) (column 3, line 28 - column 4, line 35 and Figure 2); getting a direct or indirect reference to a destination based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store (accessing an associated and networked database of user profile information in order to get references to a destinations, i.e. hyperlinks to advertiser's sites presented in the form of a customized advertising page to display to the user via the browser) (column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35 and Figure 1); and causing the browser to browse to that destination wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the destination

Art Unit: 2173

reference (browsing to, i.e. displaying the advertiser's site upon user selection of the hyperlinks presented) (column 2, lines 58-67 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 4). This is further shown in Figures 3 and 4.

Referring to claims 2 and 11, LeMole teaches the reference is an opaque reference (column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35).

Referring to claims 3 and 12, LeMole teaches setting the destination reference (column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35).

Referring to claims 5 and 14, LeMole teaches accessing a user profile store and invoking a method in the user profile store to access the user profile (accessing a CAR server which accesses a user profile database of information for the user entered ID) (column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35).

Referring to claims 6 and 16, LeMole teaches the reference is a URL (the presented customized advertising page is a webpage, which has an associated URL, delivered over the Internet; the webpage displays a list of URLs, i.e. hyperlinks) (column 2, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 27-35, column 6, lines 20-45 and Figure 3).

Referring to claim 7, LeMole teaches displaying a plurality of selectable destination redirection indicators to the user in order to select a redirection destination (displaying a list of hyperlinks to advertising sites that can be selected by the user) (column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35 and column 6, line 46 - column 7, line 35).

Referring to claims 10 and 15, LeMole teaches a first method for providing an opaque reference for the destination to the web content (producing a personal ad page including hyperlinks for the user) and a second method to cause the browser to browse to that destination

Art Unit: 2173

(returning the user selected web page on the browser) (column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35, column 4, line 59-column 5, line 4 and column 6, line 46 – column 7, line 35; this is further shown in Figures 3 and 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeMole et al. U.S. Patent 6,009,410 (hereinafter “LeMole”), as applied to claim 4 above, and Burke U.S. Patent 6,032,162.

Referring to claim 8, Le Mole teaches all of the limitations as applied to claim 4 above. Specifically, LeMole teaches displaying a different one of the selectable designators based on user information (displaying a customized ad page for each user based on user profile information) (LeMole: column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35). However, LeMole fails to explicitly teach the user information includes whether the user is inside or outside of a firewall. Burke teaches an interface for accessing Internet data based on user identification information (Burke: column 1, lines 41-46) similar to that of LeMole. In addition, Burke further teaches displaying different data based on user information such as whether the user is behind a firewall (Burke: column 3, lines 31-55). It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2173

to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of LeMole and Burke before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the display of different information based on user information from a user profile of LeMole to include user information such as whether the user is behind a firewall taught by Burke. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to allow the information displayed to the user to be customized according to security purposes, such as a security firewalls; for example, the combination can ensure that personal and sensitive information is not displayed unless a secure firewall is in place.

4. Claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-33, 35-39, 42-48, 51-54 and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeMole et al. U.S. Patent 6,009,410 (hereinafter "LeMole") and Roosen et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0036793 (hereinafter "Roosen").

Referring to claim 17, LeMole teaches all of the limitations as applied to claim 13 above. Specifically, LeMole teaches the redirection of the browser upon a direct or indirect reference (Roosen: column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35). However, LeMole fails to explicitly teach the web content calling the destination method when a print designator from web content displayed at the browser in the imaging client is indicated. Roosen teaches redirecting the browser to a destination (Roosen: page 6, paragraph 0100 and Figure 14) similar to that of LeMole. In addition, Roosen further teaches calling the destination method when a print designator from web content displayed at the browser in the imaging client is indicated (selecting a printer from a list of printers and displaying the status of the selected printer and printing documents to the printer) (Roosen: page 3, paragraph 0050-0053, page 6, paragraph 0103-0104 and further shown in Figures 3, 12, 15 and 16). It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2173

ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of LeMole and Roosen before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the browser redirection method based on user profile information of LeMole to include the activation of the method upon a print function taught by Roosen. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to facilitate fast and easy printing in a networked environment; for example, this combination allows print jobs from specific users to be sent to specific printers, i.e. according to customized user profile information in order to minimize waiting time.

Referring to claim 18, LeMole, as modified, teach a selectable designator is displayed at the browser for each of a plurality of different destination methods (pull-down list of selectable printers) (Roosen: page 6, paragraph 0103 and Figure 15).

Referring to claims 22, 30, 37 and 44, LeMole teaches a method and program product comprising the steps of receiving redirection initiation to redirect the browser (initiation of redirection of the browser via user input such as input of user ID or URL address) (LeMole: column 3, line 28 - column 4, line 35 and Figure 2), getting a direct or indirect reference to a destination based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store (accessing an associated and networked database of user profile information in order to get references to a destinations, i.e. hyperlinks to advertiser's sites presented in the form of a customized advertising page to display to the user via the browser) (LeMole: column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35 and Figure 1), and causing the browser to browse to that destination (browsing to, i.e. displaying the advertiser's site upon user selection of the hyperlinks presented) (LeMole: column 2, lines 58-67 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 4). This is further shown in Figures 3 and 4. However, Le Mole fails to explicitly teach the

Art Unit: 2173

destination being a printer list destination. Roosen teaches redirecting the browser to a destination (Roosen et al.: page 6, paragraph 0100 and Figure 14) similar to that of LeMole. In addition, Roosen further teaches redirecting the browser to a printer list destination (selecting a printer from a list of printers and displaying the status of the selected printer and printing documents to the printer) (Roosen: page 3, paragraph 0047-0053, page 6, paragraph 0100-0104 and further shown in Figures 3, 12, 15 and 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of LeMole and Roosen before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the browser redirection method based on user profile information of LeMole to include the destination of a displayed printer list taught by Roosen. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to facilitate fast and easy printing in a networked environment; for example, this combination allows print jobs from specific users to be sent to specific printers, i.e. according to customized user profile information in order to minimize waiting time.

Referring to claims 52 and 57, LeMole teaches a method and program product comprising getting a direct or indirect reference to a destination using preset settings based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store (accessing an associated and networked database of user profile information in order to get references to a destinations, i.e. hyperlinks to advertiser's sites presented in the form of a customized advertising page to display to the user via the browser) (LeMole: column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35 and Figure 1), and cause a browser to browse to that URL destination (browsing to, i.e. displaying the advertiser's site upon user selection of the hyperlinks presented) (LeMole: column 2, lines 58-67 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 4),

Art Unit: 2173

wherein the preset settings are associated with identification information from a user profile (database of user profile information associated with a user input ID) (LeMole: column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35 and Figure 1). However, LeMole fails to explicitly teach a printnow destination method that will print using preset settings. Roosen teaches causing a browser to browse to a destination (Roosen: page 6, paragraph 0100 and Figure 14) similar to that of LeMole. In addition, Roosen further teaches a printnow destination method that will print using preset settings (users select, or reference a printer for performing automatic print jobs, printing files which do not require further action by the user) (Roosen: page 2, paragraph 0024 and page 6, paragraph 0103 and Figures 15-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of LeMole and Roosen before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the browser redirection method based on user profile information of LeMole to include the printnow destination taught by Roosen. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to facilitate fast and easy printing in a networked environment; for example, this combination allows print jobs from specific users to be sent to specific printers, i.e. according to customized user profile information in order to minimize waiting time.

Referring to claims 21, 28, 35, 43 and 51, LeMole teaches the reference is an opaque reference (column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35).

Referring to claims 23, 38, 45 and 53, LeMole teaches accessing a user profile store and invoking a method in the user profile store to access the user profile (accessing a CAR server which accesses a user profile database of information for the user entered ID) (column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35).

Referring to claims 24, 39 and 54, LeMole, as modified, teach the step of displaying a plurality of selectable printer and printer list destination redirection indicators to the user in order to select a redirection destination (pull-down list of selectable printers) (Roosen et al.: page 6, paragraph 0103 and further shown in Figure 15).

Referring to claims 29 and 36, LeMole, as modified, teach setting the printer destination reference (selecting a printer from a list of printer and printing documents to the printer) (Roosen: page 6, paragraph 0100-0104 and further shown in Figures 15-16).

Referring to claims 27, 31, 42 and 46, LeMole, as modified, teach a first method for providing an opaque reference for the destination to the web content (reference to the list of printers) (Roosen: page 6, paragraph 0103 and further shown by reference character "41" in Figure 15) and a second method to cause the browser to browse to that destination (selecting a printer from the list of printers and displaying status information regarding the printer on the browser) (Roosen: page 3, paragraphs 0049-0053 and Figure 16).

Referring to claims 32 and 47, LeMole, as modified, teach the web content calls the printer list destination method when a print designator from web content displayed at the browser in the imaging client is indicated (selecting a printer destination from the list of printer destinations displayed upon the selection of the pull-down menu) (Roosen: page 6, paragraph 0103 and Figures 15-16).

Referring to claim 33, LeMole, as modified, teach the reference for the printer list destination (Roosen: page 3, paragraphs 0047-0053, page 6, paragraphs 0100-0104 and Figures 12, 15-16) is a URL (LeMole: column 2, lines 58-67, column 6, lines 20-45 and Figure 3).

Referring to claim 48, LeMole, as modified, teach a plurality of printer destination methods, each having a selectable printer designator displayed at the browser (pull-down list of a plurality of selectable printers) (Roosen: page 6, paragraph 0103 and Figure 15).

Referring to claim 58, LeMole, as modified, teach a selection method for always providing the reference to the PRINTNOW destination if predetermined criteria have been met (user has access to all the information in the web server, including the list of destination printers when the user's login information have been authorized) (Roosen: page 6, paragraph 0100).

5. Claims 19, 25, 40, 49 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeMole et al. U.S. Patent 6,009,410 (hereinafter "LeMole") and Roosen et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0036793 (hereinafter "Roosen"), as applied to claims 13, 22, 37, 44 and 52 above, and Burke U.S. Patent 6,032,162.

Referring to claims 19, 25, 40, 49 and 55, LeMole and Roosen teach all of the limitations as applied to claims 13, 22, 37, 44 and 52 above. Specifically, LeMole and Roosen teach displaying a different one of the selectable designators based on user information (displaying a customized ad page for each user based on user profile information) (LeMole: column 2, lines 58-67 and column 3, line 66 - column 4, line 35). However, LeMole and Roosen fail to explicitly teach the user information includes whether the user is inside or outside of a firewall. Burke teaches an interface for accessing Internet data based on user identification information (Burke: column 1, lines 41-46) similar to that of LeMole and Roosen. In addition, Burke further teaches displaying different data based on user information such as whether the user is behind a firewall (Burke: column 3, lines 31-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2173

the art, having the teachings of LeMole, Roosen and Burke before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the display of different information based on user information from a user profile of LeMole and Roosen to include user information such as whether the user is behind a firewall taught by Burke. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to allow the information displayed to the user to be customized according to security purposes, such as a security firewalls; for example, the combination can ensure that personal and sensitive information is not displayed unless a secure firewall is in place.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 5 October 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. With respect to claim 4 and similar claims, the applicant argues that Lemole fails to teach "getting a direct and indirect reference to a destination based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store and causing the browser to browse to that destination wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the destination reference". The examiner respectfully disagrees in view of the following:

Firstly, the applicant argues that Lemole apparently teaches that a user profile contains areas of interests and demographic data and not references to a destination. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lemole teaches that a customized list of hyperlinks, or URLs can be displayed in the form of a web page to the user based on the interests and demographic data stored in the user's profile, as recited in column 3, line 28-column 5, line 4; the displayed list of

hyperlinks provides references to destinations such as an advertiser's page; therefore, the list of references to destinations such as an advertiser's page is based on the user information such as the user's interests stored in the user profile.

Secondly, the applicant argues that Lemole seemingly teaches that a browser implements the URL for the CAR server, where the CAR server accesses a user profile of demographic data and therefore fails to teach a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lemole teaches that the user profiles are stored in a user profile store, i.e. database 112, as recited in column 4, lines 12-58; furthermore, the user profile database is connected to the server in order to communicate user profile information to the server (column 4, lines 12-58 and Figure 1) and is therefore an autonomous entity that is networked to the communications system shown in Figure 1.

Lastly, the applicant argues that Lemole seemingly teaches that the browser is directed to content from the CAR server until a user decides to view another web page at another network location and therefore fails to teach causing the browser to browse to that destination wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the destination reference. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lemole teaches the display of a list of destination references or hyperlinks to advertiser's websites based on use profile information and upon user selection of a particular hyperlink, the destination, i.e. advertiser's website is displayed on the browser, as recited in column 4, line 12-column 5, line 4 and Figures 3-4.

Therefore, the examiner respectfully argues that Lemole teaches "getting a direct and indirect reference to a destination based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store and causing the browser to browse to that destination

Art Unit: 2173

wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the destination reference”.

8. Furthermore, with respect to claim 8, the applicant argues that the combination of Lemole and Burke does not teach displaying a different one of the selectable designators based on whether the user is inside or outside a firewall. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lemole teaches the display of a plurality of different selectable designators based on a condition, i.e. displaying different hyperlinks based on the user's profile, as recited in column 4, line 12-column 5, line 4 and column 6, line 46-column 7, line 35. Burke teaches an interface similar to that of Lemole and further teaches displaying different data such as displaying a different format for access data based on user information such as whether the user behind a firewall, as recited in column 3, lines 31-55. Therefore, the combination of Lemole and Burke results in a method that displays a different one of the selectable designators, i.e. displays different hyperlinks based on information such as whether the user behind a firewall.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2173

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ



CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER